

Application No. 10/618,291  
Amendment dated October 5, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2006

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Responsive to the Official Action mailed July 6, 2006, applicants have further amended the claims of their application in an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance. Specifically, claims 1-3 and 6-9 have been cancelled, claims 10 and 14 amended, and new claims 25-28 added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The above amendment to claim 10, reciting the thermal bonded regions that surround the unbonded pillow regions in the laminate, inter alia, is supported by Figures 3 and 4 as filed, and the corresponding descriptions in the specification. New claim 20, reciting the two-layered construction and exclusive use of synthetic abrasive and absorbent nonwoven fabric layer fiber materials, inter alia, is supported by the Example described in the specification.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Amundson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,018) in view of Haynes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,962,112), applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Amundson et al. describes a wet wipe including a layered base sheet having different physical properties (See col. 3, lines 36-38), but none of the physical properties listed recites a difference in abrasiveness between two layers as represented by a difference in coefficient of friction of at least 10% (see col. 3, lines 38-44).

As explained in the present specification, the absorbent layer and the abrasive layer should exhibit at least a 10% difference in the coefficient of friction between the two layers. This difference in the coefficient of friction is believed to induce slip between the layers when a parallel shear force is applied, thus inducing "inter-layer" or "intra-laminate" abrasion, whereby

Application No. 10/618,291  
Amendment dated October 5, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2006

the surface of the layers adopt a transitory bunching or wave pattern, which enhances the cleaning performance of the inventive laminate.

Instead, the focus in Amundson et al. is on providing at least one soft and flexible layer and at least one strong and resilient layer (col. 4, lines 11-19).

Present claims 10, 11, 13-19 and 21 recite that the abrasive nonwoven fabric layer and said absorbent nonwoven fabric layer are joined together in a face to face juxtaposition so as to exhibit thermal bonded regions that surround unbonded pillow regions in the laminate. As explained in the present specification, the inventive nonwoven cleaning laminate is comprised of un-bonded or "pillow" regions having an abrasive layer to absorbent layer contact surface area in which these pillow regions are essentially free from mechanical, chemical or thermal bonding, and thus allowing for the abrasive layer and the absorbent layer to shift and distort against one another, while maintaining a durable laminate construction. These pillow regions allow the abrasive and absorbent layers in those regions *to shift and distort against one another* inside the surrounding bonded areas, while still maintaining a durable laminate construction via the grid-like bond pattern. Neither references teach or suggest these elements of the present invention.

Present claim 19 recites *a two-layered construction* and exclusive use of *synthetic* abrasive and absorbent nonwoven fabric layer fiber materials. Amundson et al. do not teach or suggest such a construction.

Applicants point out that the secondary reference to Haynes fails to compensate for the above-identified differences between the present claims and the primary reference to Amundson et al.


Application No. 10/618,291  
Amendment dated October 5, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2006

In view of at least the above differences with the present invention, the proposed combination of Amundson and Haynes et al. in the rejection does not render obvious the present claimed invention, and, accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, formal allowance of claims 10, 11, and 13-28 is believed to be in order and is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner wish to speak with applicants' attorneys, they may be reached at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required in connection with this submission to Deposit Account No. 23-0785.


Respectfully submitted,

By   
Stephen D. Geimer, Reg. No. 28,846

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER  
500 West Madison Street, Suite 3800  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-2511  
312/876-1800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage at First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on **October 5, 2006**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_